REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner's indication that Claims 3, 8, 11, and 16 include allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten as suggested in the Office Action.

The claims have been objected to for an inconsistency. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to amend instances of "web site" to "website" and to similarly amended "web sites". Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-10, and 15 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Carlson (USPN 6,697,849) in view of Pulley (U.S. Patent App. No. 2002/0087679). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Carlson and Pully teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-10, and 15.

Claims 1 and 9 claim, *inter alia*, "categorizing the received customer request for the target website as either (i) a shareable customer request which can be processed by a server assigned to another website of the web farm or (ii) an unshareable customer request which can not be processed by a server assigned to another website in the web farm."

Carlson teaches a method for caching JavaServer Page component responses (see Abstract). Carlson discloses a method of load balancing among a plurality of backend application servers for a given website (see, e.g., FIG. 2A of Carlson and the accompany description). Carlson does not teach or suggest "categorizing the received customer request for the target website as... an unshareable customer request" as claimed in Claims 1 and 9. For example, the

"sticky requests" of Carlson are the result of marking application components. Clearly then, marking application components for stickly load balancing has no connection with categorizing a request, essentially as claimed. Consider that, according to Carlson, it is not the request that cannot be shared but the application component marked as requiring sticky load balancing where it relies on session information that cannot be distributed across application servers (see col. 15, lines 19-23). Further, Carlson is clear that "requests by other clients referencing the ShopCart component may of course by processed on other servers…" Thus, Carlson has no teaching or suggestion to categorize a request, much less categorize a request as an unshareable customer request. Therefore, Carlson fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1 and 9.

Pulley teaches a method for monitoring website activity in real time (see Abstract). Pulley does not teach or suggest "categorizing the received customer request for the target website as… an unshareable customer request" as claimed in Claims 1 and 9. Pulley merely teaches how to monitor website activity. Nowhere does Pulley teach or suggest "categorizing the received customer request for the target website as… an unshareable customer request" as claimed in Claims 1 and 9. Therefore, Pulley fails to cure the deficiencies of Carlson.

The combined teachings of Carlson and Pulley teach a method for monitoring a website served by a server implementing an application component marked to sticky load balancing. The combined teachings of Carlson and Pulley fail to teach or suggest "categorizing the received customer request for the target website as… an unshareable customer request" as claimed in Claims 1 and 9.

Claims 5 and 13 are rejected as being unpatentable over Carlson and Pulley in view of Lomet (US 5,806,065).

Claims 5 and 13 depend from Claims 1 and 9, respectively. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1 and 9. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected as being unpatentable over <u>Carlson</u> in view of <u>Lomet</u> and <u>Pulley</u>, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,595 to <u>Gilbert</u>.

Claims 6 and 14 depend from Claims 1 and 9, respectively. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1 and 9. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 stands rejected as being unpatentable over <u>Carlson</u> and <u>Pulley</u> in view of <u>Lomet</u>. The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of <u>Carlson</u>, <u>Pulley</u> and <u>Lomet</u>.

Claim 17 claims, *inter alia*, "means for categorizing said customer requests received from said plurality of websites into a plurality of categories, said categories comprising shareable customer requests which can be processed by servers of different websites and unshareable customer requests which can not be processed by servers of different websites."

As discussed above, with respect to Claims 1 and 9, the combined teachings of <u>Carlson</u> and <u>Pulley</u> fail to teach or suggest categorizing a customer requests as unshareable customer requests, essentially as claimed in Claim 17.

<u>Lomet</u> teaches a data server using a distributed tree index (see Abstract). <u>Lomet</u> does not teach or suggest "means for categorizing said customer requests received from said plurality of websites into a plurality of categories, said categories comprising shareable customer requests which can be processed by servers of different websites and unshareable customer requests which can not be processed by servers of different websites" as claimed in Claim 17. Indeed, a

review of <u>Lomet</u> has failed to find any reference to a method for categorizing a request.

Therefore, <u>Lomet</u> fails to cure the deficiencies of <u>Carlson</u> and <u>Pulley</u>.

The combined teachings of <u>Carlson</u>, <u>Pulley</u> and <u>Lomet</u> fail to teach or suggest "means for categorizing said customer requests received from said plurality of websites into a plurality of categories, said categories comprising shareable customer requests which can be processed by servers of different websites and unshareable customer requests which can not be processed by servers of different websites" as claimed in Claim 17.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1-17, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 4, 2007

By: /Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889